Office Action mailed: October 28, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated: December 24, 2008

#### Remarks

This REPLY is in response to the Office Action mailed October 28, 2008. No additional fee is due with this communication.

## I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

In the Office Action mailed October 28, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 10, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/002812, hereafter Park) in view of Heckerman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,134, hereafter Heckerman). Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Heckerman and further in view of Official Notice.

# II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 1, 29, and 38, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1, 3-8, 10, 29-35, and 37-45. Reconsideration of the Application is respectfully requested.

## III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed October 28, 2008, Claims 1, 3, 5, 7-8, 10, 29-30, 32, 34-35, 37-39, 41, and 43-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park (U.S. Patent Publication Number 2004/002812) in view of Heckerman (U.S. Patent Number 6,216,134). Claims 4, 6, 31, 33, 40, and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Heckerman and further in view of Official Notice.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of searching a plurality of service provider content repositories, comprising:

providing for the representation of the plurality of service provider content repositories as a virtual content repository (VCR) that includes a content model, the content model including

a set of content nodes and a set of hierarchy of nodes such that a content node is created for each of the plurality of service provider content repositories,

Office Action mailed: October 28, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated: December 24, 2008

each content node identifies a service provider content repository, and each content node is associated with its own content schema,

a hierarchy node is created for different types of content available in the plurality of service provider content repositories, each hierarchy node is associated with one or more of the set of content nodes, and each hierarchy node is associated with its own hierarchy schema;

providing a plurality of application program interfaces (APIs), wherein each of the plurality of APIs corresponds to at least one application from a plurality of applications, that interface between the plurality of applications and the VCR wherein the APIs present a unified view of the plurality of service provider content repositories;

wherein each one of the plurality of service provider content repositories implements a service provider interface (SPI) that includes a set of interfaces and services that each service provider repository implements and wherein each SPI enables each of the corresponding service provider content repositories to access the VCR, such that each SPI interfaces between the VCR and the corresponding service provider content repository;

displaying content nodes and hierarchy nodes of the VCR in each application to enable searching of the VCR and the service provider content repositories associated therewith:

searching the VCR for information that satisfies a search expression, including searching the VCR and the service provider content repositories associated therewith wherein the search expression is mapped by the APIs to each SPI to search across multiple content repositories and wherein content caches are used to buffer search results from recently accessed content nodes or hierarchy nodes; and

providing search results.

Park discloses a content publication system supporting real-time integration and processing of multimedia content including dynamic data. (Abstract). The repository 8 includes a content repository 70, a converter object repository 90, and a media converter repository 95. (Paragraph [0040]). A basic logical unit stored in the content repository 70 is a container 74, and one or more containers 74 can be stored in the content repository 70. A single container 74 conceptionally [sic] indicates a single virtual page of a logical web site. Additionally, the container 74 is a basic unit of storage. In other words, when containers are stored in a file system, a single container 74 is stored in a single file. (Paragraph [0041]).

Heckerman discloses a system that provides for the graphic visualization of the categories of a collection of records. (Abstract). The user interface component inputs data from the collection storage component and the category storage component and generates the various category graphs which are displayed on display 806. (Column 15, lines 8-12).

As described above, Applicant respectfully submits that Park appears to disclose a system that includes a single content repository. The repository appears to include containers which are the fundamental unit of the repository and each of which represent a single page of a web site.

Office Action mailed: October 28, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated: December 24, 2008

Claim 1 defines a plurality of service provider content repositories. Park, however, only

appears to disclose a single content repository. To more clearly define this, Claim 1 has been

amended to define that the APIs present a unified view of the plurality of service provider

content repositories. As noted above, Park, in view of Heckerman, only appears to disclose a

single content repository that includes containers. Each container is a single file that represents

a web page. Each container is not a service provider content repository. The single repository

of Park is not a plurality of service provider content repositories that are represented as a single

virtual content repository. Applicant respectfully submits that Park, in view of Heckerman, does

not disclose or render obvious a plurality of service provider content repositories as defined in

Claim 1.

Additionally, Claim 1, has also been amended to more clearly define that the search

expression is mapped by the APIs to each SPI to search across multiple content repositories

and wherein content caches are used to buffer search results from recently accessed content

nodes or hierarchy nodes. Since, as described above, the cited references only include a single

content repository, Applicant respectfully submits that the references do not appear to disclose

that the search expression is mapped by the APIs to each SPI to search across multiple content

repositories. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that neither reference appears to

disclose a content cache used to buffer search results from recently accessed content nodes or

hierarchy nodes.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently

amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references, and

reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 38

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by

reference. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully

submits that Claims 29 and 38 are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the

cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-8, 10, 30-35, 37, and 39-45

Claims 3-8, 10, 30-35, 37, and 39-45 depend from and include all of the features of

Claims 1, 29, or 38. Claims 3-8, 10, 30-35, 37, and 39-45 have not been addressed separately

but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable

- 11 -

Office Action mailed: October 28, 2008

Reply to Office Action dated: December 24, 2008

independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3-8, 10, 30-35, 37, and 39-45 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

### IV. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 24, 2008 By: /Nathan L. Feld/

Nathan L. Feld Reg. No. 59,725

FLIESLER MEYER LLP 650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor San Francisco, California 94108 Telephone: (415) 362-3800

Customer No. 80548